

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SCOTT JOHNSON,  
PLAINTIFF,

Case No. 4:21-cv-1404-YGR

v.  
COUNTRY CLUB VILLA SHOPPING CENTER,  
LLC,

v.  
HONG ZHENG, ET AL.,

Case No. 4:21-cv-9303-YGR

v.  
TONG & TUNG PROPERTIES, LLC, ET AL.,

Case No. 4:21-cv-3128-YGR

v.  
EK FOOD SERVICES, INC.,  
DEFENDANTS.

Case No. 4:21-cv-4843-YGR

BRIAN WHITAKER,  
PLAINTIFF,

Case No. 4:21-cv-5538-YGR

v.  
L & D BISTRO AND CATERING, INC.,  
DEFENDANT.

ORLANDO GARCIA,  
PLAINTIFF,

Case No. 4:21-cv-5935-YGR

v.  
IPV ASSOCIATES, LLC, ET AL.,  
DEFENDANTS.

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

**TO PLAINTIFFS AND PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL OF RECORD:**

Plaintiffs and plaintiffs' counsel's prosecution of these cases have failed to comply with the deadlines set forth by General Order 56. The purpose of General Order 56 is to provide efficient and cost-effective procedures for parties to attempt to resolve genuine disputes arising

under the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”). Failure to comply with those procedures threatens to undermine the important civil rights claimed to be vindicated when scores of ADA claims are filed without prosecution. Therefore, you are **HEREBY ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE** in writing no later than June 30, 2022, why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. Failure to timely file a substantive written response will result in the case being dismissed.

**IN ADDITION**, Dennis Jay Price, II, Prathima Reddy Price, and Amanda Seabock are **HEREBY ON NOTICE** that the Court is considering referring each to the Court’s Standing Committee on Professional Conduct for their failure to prosecute cases. Not only are the judges in the District questioning the propriety of the filing of thousands of lawsuits but, if filed, plaintiffs’ counsel are aware of the timing of this District’s General Order 56 and obligation to comply therewith.

The law firm of Potter Handy is **HEREBY ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE** in writing no later than June 30, 2022, why the following cases should not be either dismissed for failure to prosecute or a \$250.00 sanction be assessed for failure to comply with General Order 56 on each of the following cases on the undersigned’s docket:

*Johnson v. Country Club Villa Shopping Center, LLC*, No. 4:21-cv-01404

*Johnson v. Zheng, et al.*, No. 4:21-cv-09303

*Johnson v. Tong & Tung Properties, LLC, et al.*, No. 4:21-cv-03128

*Johnson v. EK Food Services, Inc.*, No. 4:21-cv-04843

*Whitaker v. L & D Bistro and Catering, Inc.*, No. 4:21-cv-05538

*Garcia v. IPV Associates, LLC, et al.*, No. 4:21-cv-05935

This is not the first time that the undersigned has issued orders to show cause in cases involving the above-mentioned counsel. Given the volume before the undersigned, it appears that counsel is filing suits without the ability, capacity, or intention to comply with General Order 56 in a timely manner.

**PLAINTIFFS AND COUNSEL ARE ADVISED** that a notice to voluntarily dismiss the case will be deemed a concession that a \$250.00 sanction is appropriate as no good cause can support a response. The sanction will thus be ordered.

3